

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 495

RC 016 007

AUTHOR Chi, Peter S. K.
TITLE Employment and Economic Profiles of Black Migrant Farmworkers in New York and Implications for Future Immigration Policy.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Salt Lake City, UT, August 26-30, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Blacks; Comparative Analysis; Educational Attainment; *Employment Level; Females; Fringe Benefits; *Immigrants; Job Search Methods; Males; *Migrant Employment; Migrants; *Migrant Workers; Seasonal Laborers; Sex Differences; Socioeconomic Status; *Wages
IDENTIFIERS *New York (Wayne County)

ABSTRACT

Employment characteristics, including employment status, history, and employment search patterns, were compared among three migrant groups--immigrants, recent migrants, and long-term migrants--from a representative sample of 218 migrant farmworkers randomly drawn in Wayne County, New York, during the summer of 1982. Results indicated that immigrants were very competitive in employment and had levels of weekly wages, annual income, and fringe benefits similar to those of native-born migrants. The same comparisons of employment and economic profiles were also made between male and female native-born migrants. It was found that female migrant farmworkers received lower weekly wages and a smaller number of fringe benefits than their male native-born counterparts. Determinants of weekly wages were analyzed in a multiple regression model. It was found that a migrant farmworker's weekly wage is primarily determined by two selected background variables--sex and migrant status--and such basic human capital variables as formal education. Another separate model indicates that employers tended to provide more fringe benefits to those recent migrants who have worked for a long period of time, are productive, and have high scores on mental health status. Impacts of potential changes in future immigration policy on native-born migrant farmworkers are discussed with reference to the findings. (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

KC01600塞子

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

Abstract

Employment characteristics, including employment status, employment history and employment search patterns, were compared among three migrant groups, immigrants, recent migrants and long-term migrants, from a representative sample of migrant farmworkers randomly drawn in Wayne County, New York, during the summer of 1982.

The results indicated that immigrants were very competitive in employment and had levels of weekly wages, annual income and fringe benefits similar to those of native-born migrants. The same comparisons of employment and economic profiles were also made between male and female native-born migrants. It was found that female migrant farmworkers received lower weekly wages and a smaller number of fringe benefits than their male native-born counterparts.

The determinants of weekly wages were analyzed in a multiple regression model. It was found that a migrant farmworker's weekly wage is primarily determined by two selected background variables--sex and migrant status, and such basic human capital variable as formal education. Another separate model indicates that employers tend to provide more fringe benefits to those recent migrants who have worked for a long period of time, are productive, and have high scores on mental health status.

Impacts of some potential changes in future immigration policy on native-born migrant farmworkers are discussed with reference to the findings.

U. S. immigration policies have, in the past, created the net effect of producing an oversupply of farm labor, which has directly and negatively affected the ability of migratory farmworkers to bargain collectively for fair wages and decent working conditions (Glover, 1983; Briggs, 1985). Many farms, especially those in the labor-intensive fruit and vegetable sectors, have long relied on successive waves of legal and illegal immigrants. Recent vivid debates in the U. S. Congress on immigration reform and control will certainly influence future immigration policy and foreign worker programs. Since illegal immigration is growing rapidly and the majority of Americans polled on the issue are in favor of controlling it, Congress will probably act on immigration legislation sometime in the near future.

The pending Immigration Reform and Control Act (the Simpson and Mazzoli bill) would penalize employers for hiring illegal immigrant workers, would make some illegal aliens legal residents, and would establish a modified foreign worker program for agriculture. Empirical research on the potential effects of this immigration policy on the domestic labor market is needed not only for legislators but also for employers and workers as well. Coltrane's work (1984) only partially meets this need. Because of the absence of adequate data, Coltrane can only analyze farm labor expenditures by location and commodity in order to determine indirectly what types of farms and areas might be affected by the new legislation.

This study attempts to make an empirical analysis of employment characteristics of a representative sample of migrant farmworkers in Wayne County, New York. Patterns of their annual income, weekly wages and fringe benefits are separately examined. Determinants of weekly wages and fringe benefits will also be analyzed in two multiple regression models. It is hoped that results from this study will provide some basic understanding

about migrant farmworkers' employment and economic situations and that some findings may be of value in assessing the potential impact of the pending legislation on migratory farmworkers.

Source of Data

The present study is based on data obtained from the New York Migrant Health Interview Survey conducted in Wayne County, New York in the summer of 1982. Since the largest concentration of migratory farmworkers in the state is in Wayne County, it is an ideal research site for surveying migrant economic conditions. In order to obtain a representative sample of migrant farmworkers, a special sampling procedure was designed for this survey. The first step was to compile a comprehensive list of addresses for all migrant camps and other migrant housing units in Wayne County. All units on the list were stratified according to the size of maximum capacity. The total number of migrants that could be accommodated in each size category was known. A representative sample of 218 migrants was randomly drawn through a three-stage sampling procedure from all size categories (the sample size was determined by budget constraints). Special efforts were made on October 21, 1982 to find out from owners of migrant camps and other housing units how many migrant workers were actually living in the units. On the assumption that the sampled migrants had characteristics similar to those of migrants enumerated on October 21, the interviewed migrants can be considered a representative sample of total migrant workers in Wayne County on that day (the detailed sampling procedure is described in Chi, 1985a).

During the 1982 migrant health survey, seven Cornell undergraduate students were hired as interviewers, and one graduate student as project coordinator. All the interviewers had some survey experience through course

work in field studies or in research methods. They were also trained in special sessions designed for the migrant project. The project coordinator assigned sampled camps or housing units to interviewers and supervised their daily interview activities. Before the actual interviewing began, the coordinator sent letters to local growers, requesting permission for the interviewers to enter farms and to interview randomly selected migrants. Personal interviews were conducted between early July and early November. Just before the scheduled interview period, a preliminary test of the questionnaire was conducted among 10 migrant farmworkers in the county, and appropriate revisions were made.

Since Cornell Cooperative Extension has operated active migrant education programs in Wayne County for more than 10 years, it enjoys a positive relationship with people and organizations in the area. The present research, with the assistance of Cornell Cooperative Extension, received the full support of local growers and migrant farmworkers. As a result, the rate of interview refusals was very low (less than seven percent of the total sample) and did not vary systematically from camp to camp.

Of the 218 migrant farmworkers in our sample, 76.6 percent were native-born Americans. Also, over 95 percent were black; 77 percent were male and the mean age was 35 years. In general, migrant farmworkers in our sample had a low socioeconomic status. Mean educational level was 9.5 years of schooling and mean annual household income was \$5,327 in 1981. Since respondents in our sample were predominately black, the results from this study can be generalized for black migrant farmworkers in New York State.

Although all migrant farmworkers usually engage in similar farmwork (harvesting fruits in the field or processing fruits in the canning plant), they are not a homogeneous social group. Previous studies have found that

black American migrant farmworkers differed from black immigrants in work conditions, work attitude, work productivity, and mobility opportunities (Nelkin, 1970; Friedland and Nelkin, 1971; Foner and Napoli, 1978).

In our Wayne County survey, three distinct migrant groups were identified. The first group consisted of immigrants from Puerto Rico or from other countries (mostly Haiti and Jamaica); the second group, recent migrants, included native-born farmworkers who had made seasonal migrations to New York State for less than 3 years; and the third group, long-term migrants, was composed of those native-born farmworkers who had made a seasonal migration to New York State for 3 or more years.

Employment Profile

Employment characteristics of the total sample, including employment status, employment history, employment search patterns and reasons for seasonal migratory work, will first be compared among three migrant groups (immigrants, recent migrants and long-term migrants), followed by an analysis of sex differences in employment characteristics. Since immigrants are predominately male, this latter comparison is limited to native-born migrant farmworkers.

Comparisons by Migrant Status

Employment status, determined by working experience a week prior to the survey, is presented in Table 1. Over 70 percent of immigrants were employed full-time in that week, compared with 55 percent of long-term migrants and only 50 percent of recent migrants. Recent migrant farmworkers led in part-time employment (46%), followed by long-term migrants (32%) and immigrants (24%). Unemployment in the reference week was generally low among migrant farmworkers; the highest rate (6.5%) was found for long-term

migrants and the lowest (1.8%), for immigrants. In sum, immigrants tend to be in a better employment situation than their native-born counterparts during the summer working season.

Long-term migrants have worked an average of 19 years as farmworkers and a large proportion of this migratory working history was spent in New York State (13 years, Table 1). Further, long-term migrants, on average, have worked over seven years for the same employer. Similar patterns were observed for immigrants and recent migrant farmworkers, except for shorter periods of time due to their youthfulness and more recent participation in migration streams. The persistent working history observed from the survey data indicates that (1) seasonal migration is not a random process but a systematically recurring event; and (2) migrant farmworkers are loyal workers in Agriculture and should be treated as integral parts of both sending and receiving communities.

Crew leaders used to be a major mechanism for recruiting migrant farmworkers (Metzler, 1955; Larson, 1968) and some of them were also considered a source of exploitation in migratory farmwork. Data in Table 1 indicate that only 20 percent of our respondents relied on crew leaders for finding farm jobs. Nearly half of the farmworkers found employment opportunity through other migrant farmworkers; a portion (13%) obtained migratory jobs through their household heads, who may have been working for the same employers; and over 18 percent found jobs through employment services or were directly contacted by employers. These findings clearly indicate that today's migrant farmworkers are more likely to obtain farm employment information in New York State from direct rather than indirect sources, which may reduce the potential for middle-level exploitation. The three migrant groups in general followed the same job search pattern and no

significant difference was found among them ($P = .144$). When migrating to do farm work, immigrants were more likely than native-born migrants to travel with a group of other workers, whereas recent and long-term migrants were more likely than immigrants to travel with their relatives (Sections 3(1) and 3(2), Table 1). The legal and geographic barriers placed on immigrants may account for these differences.

Lack of employment opportunities at home was the primary push factor for seeking seasonal migratory work (48%), with about 27 percent of respondents reporting higher wages in receiving communities as a pull factor (Sec. 4, Table 1). About a quarter of migrants cited non-economic factors (such as enjoying traveling, better weather or other idiosyncratic reasons) as the major reason for joining the migratory labor force. Overall, we may conclude that seasonal migration is an economically motivated activity.

Comparisons by Sex

Sex differentials in employment characteristics of native-born migrants are presented in Table 2. Unlike male migrant farmworkers, female workers were more likely to rely on their household heads to find farm jobs (10% vs. 34%, respectively). On the other hand, men were more likely than women to seek employment through crew leaders, employment services or other sources even though the largest proportions of both groups (42% of males and 55% of females) obtained job information from other farmworkers.

Another significant sex difference was found in motivation for migratory farmwork. A higher proportion of female respondents (86%) than their male counterparts (68%) were doing farm work for economic reasons (combining "make more money" and "no work at home"). This finding seems to imply that a majority of married women supplemented their family income

through migratory farm work while some single male migrants did participate in migration streams for non-economic reasons.

Employment status, employment history and traveling patterns of male and female native-born migrant farmworkers were rather similar (no statistically significant differences were found). In general, over 53 percent of native-born migrants were employed full-time, and 37 percent were employed part-time. They have, on average, worked 14.8 years as farmworkers, out of which 9 years were in New York State for at least part of the year and for over 5 years worked for the same employers. When they traveled to do farm work, 45 percent were accompanied by other farmworkers, most of whom were their own relatives.

Economic Profile

Since seasonal migration is primarily economically motivated, the following analysis will focus on migrants' income, wages and fringe benefits. Annual household income was determined by asking respondents to check a correct category on a schedule of income intervals. Weekly wages were calculated following three steps: first, determining whether a respondent was paid weekly or hourly rate, or by piece rate; second, ascertaining the basic pay rates and number of units (e.g. hours, bins, boxes) worked in the reference week; and finally deriving weekly wages by multiplying the number of work units by the corresponding pay rate. In addition to income and weekly wages, respondents were asked to check a list of 12 fringe benefits which could be provided by their employers. Only 8 specific fringe benefits that had been received by at least 9 percent of the sampled respondents are presented in Table 3.

Comparisons of economic characteristics among the three migrant groups are shown in Table 3. The most striking finding from the table is that no significant differences in wages and income were found among the three migrant groups. In general, over 84 percent of migrant farmworkers were paid by piece rate and about 16 percent were paid by weekly or hourly rate. The average piece rate was \$7.17 per bin and the mean hourly rate was \$3.15 in the summer of 1982. As a result, the mean weekly wage was around \$212. The three migrant groups also had similar distributions of 1981 total household income (Sec. 1, Table 3).

Out of eight major fringe benefits, only workman's compensation and transportation showed significant differences among the three migrant groups. About 49 percent of recent migrants and 40 percent of long-term migrants in our sample reported that they had been included in Workman's Compensation insurance, compared with only 21 percent of immigrants. While 48 percent of immigrants and 49 percent of recent migrants enjoyed free transportation from migrant camps to work site during working days, only 26 percent of long-term migrants received such a benefit from their employers. This difference may be due to the fact that ownership of private automobiles was higher for the latter than for the former groups since long-term migrants have continuously participated in seasonal migration streams for a long period of time. The distributions of other fringe benefits and the average number of fringe benefits received are quite similar among the three groups (Sec. 5, Table 3).

Sex differences in income, wages and fringe benefits of native-born migrants are presented in Table 4. Although male and female migrant farmworkers were paid according to the same basic rates (no significant differences were found between men and women in terms of average hourly rate

and piece rate), about three times more male than female migrant farmworkers were paid on a weekly and hourly basis (21% vs. 7% respectively) whereas 93 percent of female migrants and 79 percent of male migrants were paid by piece rate. The average weekly wage for women (\$159) was significantly lower than mean weekly wage for men (\$214). The sex difference in weekly wages may be attributed to three factors: first, because of food preparation, child care or other household functions, women may devote less time to market work than men; second, payment by hourly rate may be more favorable than piece rate and more women than men were paid on a piece rate basis; and third, since some farm jobs demand strenuous physical effort and endurance, women may be less productive than men (that is, produce a lower output within the same time unit).

The distributions of fringe benefits are quite similar between male and female migrant farmworkers, except that a higher proportion of men (20%) than women (7%) were provided with bonus or cash gifts by their employers (Sec. 5(8), Table 4). Overall, men also received a larger number of fringe benefits than women (3.57 vs. 2.92, respectively).

Determinants of Wages and Fringe Benefits

In the literature, the determinants of differential rewards for individual workers are usually analyzed according to two general approaches, institutional and human capital. The institutional approach primarily centers on the importance of institutionally determined inequality of opportunities. It also recognizes the role of ability, chance and risk-taking. Because its emphasis is on the relationships between earnings and a variety of social-environmental factors, the institutional approach has contributed to applied statistical analysis of income distribution. Such

institutional and demographic variables as age, sex, education, occupation, location and family wealth have been used as independent variables in the multivariate analyses of individual income differences (Adams, 1958; Hill, 1959; Morgan et al. 1962; Jencks et al. 1972; Duncan et al. 1972).

Another version of the institutional approach is to view differential ability as an important determinant of differences in productivity that, in turn, is related to wage differentials. However, it was found that the distribution of abilities was not the same as the distribution of earnings (Pigou, 1920). In some recent studies, individual ability was therefore used as an additional variable to explain residual variation in income distribution, after institutional and demographic variables were statistically controlled (Roy, 1950; Adams, 1958; Jencks et al. 1972; Duncan et al. 1972).

A third version of the institutional approach is the dual labor-market theory, which explains differential economic rewards in structural terms as an outcome of the creation of different labor-market sectors (Edwards et al., 1975; Beck et al, 1978). According to the theory, the labor-market is divided into primary and secondary sectors that are characterized by different labor-force conditions. Primary sector jobs are represented by relatively high wages, good working conditions, excellent chances of advancement and long-term employment stability. Secondary sector jobs tend to be low paying, with poor working conditions, little chance for advancement and no employment stability. Primary workers will not seek jobs in the secondary market, while secondary workers will find it difficult, if not impossible, to move into the primary sector.

In contrast, the human capital approach singles out individual investment behavior as a basic factor in explaining variation in labor

incomes. Differences in wages are due strictly to differences in productivity. Variation in productivity is a direct result of different levels of investment in human capital factors, i.e. education, training and work experience (Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1974). Thus, the only barriers to occupational mobility and higher wages for workers derive from limitations imposed by workers' levels of education, skills and experience.

This study attempts to incorporate both institutional and human capital approaches into empirical models. We hypothesize that the weekly wages of full-time employed migrant farmworkers are primarily determined by a set of human capital variables as well as by a set of structural variables. The selected human capital variables include: formal education (measured by the number of school years completed), farmwork experience (measured by the number of years worked as a farmworker) and mental health status (measured by the Index of General Well-Being, see Chi, 1986). The number of years worked for the same employer is used as a proxy for specific training which has no effect on the productivity of trainees that would be useful in other work situations (Becker, 1964). Age, sex and migrant status (the classification of the three migrant groups) are treated as institutional variables that exist in the migratory labor-market and may influence migrants' wage earnings.

The results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 5. Three significant variables are identified in the model-education, sex and migrant status. More educated and male migrants tend to earn higher weekly wages than less educated and female migrant farmworkers. When other variables are statistically controlled immigrants tend to earn more than native-born migrants. However, since native-born migrants have a significantly higher

educational level than immigrants (Chi, 1985b), the mean weekly wages for both groups are very similar (Sect. (4), Table 3).

It is of particular interest to note that education is one of the major determinants of weekly wages in such secondary sectors as migrant farmwork. In a low paying job, where skill requirement tends to be minimal, why should education be an important factor in explaining wage differentials? One possible explanation may be that educated migrant farmworkers were more knowledgeable about migratory seasonal markets than the less educated. The former group tends to find the job earlier and to seek easy harvest work first (e.g. to pick up apples from lower trees). Another reason may be that educated workers are more organized in their working process and, therefore, more productive than less educated migrants.

Farm employers have historically provided hired farmworkers with a variety of perquisites, ranging from housing and transportation to garden lots. These fringe benefits have furnished non-cash income to many migrant farmworkers. Dawson (1965) estimated that the perquisite value in selected counties of New Mexico would amount to about 25 to 30 percent of the worker's cash wage. In this study, respondents were asked to report whether they have received a set of fringe benefits, no attempt is made to estimate the monetary value of these benefits. Determinants of the number of fringe benefits received are analyzed in Table 5. In addition to all the independent variables used in the previous model, weekly wages are included as an exogenous variable to test the "equalizing differences" hypothesis. This hypothesis states that higher fringe benefits may be partially offset by lower wages (Schiller and Weiss, 1977). That is, current wages may be reduced in order to pay for more fringe benefits.

The results in Table 5 indicate that farm employers tend to provide more fringe benefits to recent migrants who have worked for the same employer for a longer period of time and have higher scores on mental health status. Using data on the earning histories and pension status of individual workers in 133 large firms, Schiller and Weiss (1977) found a negative relationship between pension benefits and current wages. Our data indicate that, unlike the general population, those migrant farmworkers who have earned higher weekly wages also tend to receive a large number of fringe benefits. In other words, farm employers do not use fringe benefits as a substitute for current wages. Instead, fringe benefits were considered as bonuses for productive work, if weekly wages are viewed as proxy for the worker's productivity. The differences in findings from these two studies may be attributed to two factors: first, Schiller and Weiss' work deals with primary sector jobs, while this study is concerned with migratory work in the secondary sector. The relationships between wage earnings and fringe benefits may be quite different in the two sectors. Second, pension benefits, as examined in Schiller and Weiss' study, may be viewed as a deferred future income which enables individuals to reallocate their resources over time according to their taste. The number of fringe benefits considered in this study is a one-time reward for current work well done. Therefore, they may have different relationships with wage earnings.

Discussion

According to recent legislative developments, two important aspects of the Simpson and Mazzoli bill may be likely to affect future immigration policy: the provision of amnesty for a large number of illegal immigrant workers and establishment of a modified guest-worker program for

agriculture. The impacts of these potential changes on native-born migrant farmworkers will be discussed with reference to the findings from this study.

First, since employees can perceive a direct link between work efforts and their earnings, it is believed that the piece rate system tends to increase the worker's productivity. On the whole, over 84 percent of migrant farmworkers in our sample were paid a piece rate (see Table 3). As the supply of immigrants increases through amnesty and guest-worker programs, even more migrant farmworkers would be paid at piece rate. Furthermore, increasing competition for seasonal employment in agriculture would set a limit on available full-time job opportunities, and could pressure a reduction in wage rate even below the legal minimum level (because minimum wage levels are set at hourly rates and no legal piece rates are specified).

Second, since female migrants can devote less time to farmwork or may be less productive than their male counterparts, some part-time female migrant farmworkers could be replaced by more productive full-time male workers in a competitive market.

Third, since education is one of the major determinants of weekly wages and native-born migrants have a significant higher educational level than immigrants, native-born migrant farmworkers have a competitive advantage over immigrant workers. However, other things being equal, immigrants are more likely to earn higher wages than native-born migrant farmworkers (see Table 5).

Fourth, since provision of fringe benefits is positively associated with weekly wages, the incentive for offering such bonuses would be greatly

reduced if the supply of immigrant farmworkers is significantly increased through amnesty and guest-worker programs.

Finally, since most immigrants tend to use farmwork as a springboard for upward mobility in the United States (Foner and Napoli, 1978), native-born migrants may be a more reliable source for seasonal farmwork. As farm employers prefer to provide more fringe benefits for those long-term farmworkers who can get along with other workers (as indicated by higher mental health scores, see Table 5), native-born migrants who are willing to make a long-term investment in agriculture can still establish a stable career in this sector.

Table 1: Employment Characteristics by Migrant Status,
Wayne, County, N.Y. 1982

Characteristics	Total	Migrant Status		
		Immigrants	Recent Migrants	Long-term Migrants
1. Employment status last week.				
Full-time farmwork	58.06	73.23	50.02	55.19
Part-time farmwork	33.93	24.97	45.87	31.68
Unemployed	8.01	1.80	4.12	13.13
N	215	51	58	106
	$\chi^2 = 13.66$	$P = 0.009$		
2. Employment history				
(1) No. of years worked as farmworkers.				
$\bar{X}$	13.17	8.02	6.91	19.10
N	211	46	65	100
	$F = 34.1$	$P = 0.0$		
(2) No. of years worked in N.Y. at least part of the year.				
$\bar{X}$	7.65	3.24	1.94	12.96
N	215	48	66	101
	$F = 96.17$	$P = 0.0$		
(3) No. of years of farm-work for this employer				
$\bar{X}$	4.68	2.55	1.94	7.24
N	215	48	66	101
	$F = 38.46$	$P = 0.0$		

Table 1: (Continued)

Characteristics	Total	Migrant Status		
		Immigrants	Recent Migrants	Long-term Migrants
3. Employment search patterns				
1. When you travel to do farm work, do you (and your family) usually travel with a group of other workers?				
No	51.43	37.59	40.77	64.24
Yes	48.57	62.41	59.23	35.76
N	215	51	59	105
		$\chi^2 = 13.49$	$P = 0.001$	
2. If yes, are they your relatives?				
No	61.55	82.75	53.04	52.39
Yes	38.45	17.25	46.96	47.61
N	105	31	35	40
		$\chi^2 = 8.37$	$P = 0.015$	
3. How did you find out about farm jobs?				
Crew leader	20.42	16.34	20.77	22.16
Other workers	48.15	59.75	48.96	42.20
Household head	13.13	1.46	13.69	18.34
Others	18.30	22.44	16.58	17.29
N	215	50	59	106
		$\chi^2 = 12.17$	$P = 0.144$	
4. The most important reason for traveling to do farm work.				
Make more money	26.87	19.98	35.96	25.09
No work at home	47.59	60.27	36.67	47.60
Other	25.54	19.74	27.37	27.30
N	217	51	59	106
		$\chi^2 = 6.95$	$P = 0.139$	

Table 2: Employment Characteristics of Native-born Migrants
by Sex, Wayne County, N.Y., 1982

Characteristics	Total	Male	Female
1. Employment status last week:			
Full-time farmworker	53.59	54.66	50.85
Part-time farmworker	36.58	37.08	35.29
Unemployed	9.83	8.26	13.86
N	166	120	47
	$\chi^2 = 1.54$	$P = 0.672$	
2. Employment history			
(1) No. of years worked as farmworkers:			
$\bar{X}$	14.80	14.98	14.33
N	168	123	45
	$F = 0.09$	$P = 0.766$	
(2) No. of years worked in N.Y. at least part of the year:			
$\bar{X}$	9.02	9.70	7.25
N	170	124	46
	$F = 3.19$	$P = 0.076$	
(3) No. of years of farmwork for this employer:			
$\bar{X}$	5.34	5.45	5.03
N	170	124	46
	$F = 0.22$	$P = 0.639$	
3. Employment search patterns			
(1) When you travel to do farm work, do you (and your family) usually travel with a group of other workers?			
No	55.12	51.70	64.07
Yes	44.88	48.30	35.93
N	166	120	46
	$\chi^2 = 2.05$	$P = 0.152$	
(2) If yes, are they your relatives?			
No	53.83	52.51	58.35
Yes	46.17	47.49	41.65
N	76	59	17
	$\chi^2 = 0.18$	$P = 0.669$	

Table 2: (Continued)

Characteristics	Total	Male	Female
(3) How did you find out about farm jobs?			
Crew leader	21.43	26.64	8.04
Other workers	45.23	41.56	54.67
Household head	16.49	9.82	33.63
Others	16.85	21.99	3.67
N	169	120	47
	$\chi^2 = 26.11$	P = 0.0	
(4) The most important reason for traveling to do farm work:			
Make more money	29.22	27.47	33.77
No work at home	43.75	40.25	52.81
Other	27.03	32.28	13.42
N	168	121	47
	$\chi^2 = 6.10$	P = 0.047	

Table 3: Income, Wages and Fringe Benefits by Migrant Status,
Wayne County, New York, 1982

Characteristics	Total	Migrant Status		
		Immigrants	Recent Migrants	Long-term Migrants
1. Total household income in 1981				
(1) 0 - \$3,000	31.43	23.35	42.00	29.08
(2) \$3,001 - \$6,000	34.31	33.48	36.00	33.72
(3) \$6,001 - \$9,000	21.58	27.00	14.32	23.26
(4) \$9,001 and over	12.67	16.17	7.68	13.93
N	203	46	57	100
		$x^2 = 7.06$	$P = 0.315$	
2. How was respondent paid?				
Weekly or hourly rate	15.69	9.62	15.57	19.08
Piece rate	84.31	90.38	84.43	80.92
N	198	50	56	91
		$x^2 = 2.19$	$P = 0.334$	
3. Piece rate (per bin)				
$\bar{X}$	\$7.17	\$7.80	\$7.09	\$6.84
N	154	38	48	68
		$F = 2.10$	$P = .126$	
4. Weekly wages				
$\bar{X}$	\$212.06	\$248.02	\$207.19	\$191.42
N	131	33	36	62
		$F = 2.02$	$P = 0.137$	
5. Fringe benefits				
(1) Workman's compensation				
No	62.06	78.51	50.99	60.35
Yes	17.94	21.49	49.01	39.65
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 9.09$	$P = 0.011$	
(2) Free or reduced rate commodities				
No	90.87	93.71	93.46	88.06
Yes	9.13	6.29	6.54	11.94
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 1.99$	$P = 0.370$	
(3) Housing				
No	13.31	7.24	13.83	15.94
Yes	86.69	92.76	86.17	84.06
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 2.28$	$P = 0.319$	

Table 3: (Continued)

Characteristics	Total	Migrant Status		
		Immigrants	Recent Migrants	Long-term Migrants
(4) Transportation				
No	62.40	51.79	51.41	73.64
Yes	37.60	48.21	48.59	26.36
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 11.23$	$P = 0.004$	
(5) Utilities				
No	14.14	11.44	11.47	16.93
Yes	85.86	88.56	88.53	83.07
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 1.34$	$P = 0.513$	
(6) Garden plots				
No	87.66	91.83	79.83	90.03
Yes	12.34	8.17	20.17	9.97
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 4.74$	$P = 0.093$	
(7) Loans				
No	63.89	57.74	65.64	65.87
Yes	36.11	42.26	34.36	34.13
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 1.10$	$P = 0.578$	
(8) Bonus or cash gifts				
No	84.62	86.61	77.79	87.49
Yes	15.38	13.39	22.21	12.51
N	217	51	59	106
		$x^2 = 2.96$	$P = 0.228$	
(9) Total number of fringe benefits received				
$\bar{X}$	3.37	3.33	3.75	3.18
N	215	48	66	101
		$F = 0.34$	$P = 0.710$	

Table 4: Income, Wages and Fringe Benefits of Native-born Migrants
by Sex, Wayne County, New York, 1982

Characteristics	Total	Male	Female
1. Total household income in 1981			
(1) 0 - \$3,000	33.88	32.98	36.18
(2) \$3,001 - \$6,000	34.65	36.46	30.05
(3) \$6,001 - \$9,000	19.89	19.13	21.81
(4) \$9,001 and over	11.59	11.43	11.97
N	158	113	45
	$x^2 = 0.60$	$P = 0.897$	
2. How was respondent paid?			
Weekly or hourly rate	17.53	21.32	7.20
Piece rate	82.47	78.68	92.80
N	147	109	40
	$x^2 = 4.05$	$P = 0.044$	
3. Piece rate (per bin)			
$\bar{X}$	\$6.95	\$7.08	\$6.67
N	119	84	35
	$F = 0.79$	$P = 0.377$	
4. Weekly Wages			
$\bar{X}$	\$197.97	\$213.94	\$159.01
N	101	74	27
	$F = 3.29$	$P = 0.073$	
5. Fringe Benefits			
(1) Workman's Compensation			
No	56.92	55.37	60.93
Yes	43.08	44.63	39.07
N	168	121	47
	$x^2 = 0.43$	$P = 0.574$	
(2) Free or reduced rate commodities			
No	89.55	89.11	90.69
Yes	10.45	10.89	9.31
N	168	121	47
	$x^2 = 0.09$	$P = 0.764$	
(3) Housing			
No	15.29	15.47	14.83
Yes	84.71	84.53	85.17
N	168	121	47
	$x^2 = 0.01$	$P = 0.917$	
(4) Transportation			
No	65.22	63.58	69.48
Yes	34.78	36.42	30.32
N	168	121	47
	$x^2 = 0.51$	$P = 0.473$	

Table 4: (Continued)

Characteristics	Total	Male	Female
(5) Utilities			
No	15.36	15.55	14.86
Yes	84.64	84.45	85.14
N	168	121	47
	$\chi^2 = 0.01$	$P = 0.911$	
(6) Garden plots			
No	85.52	84.04	92.94
Yes	13.48	15.96	7.06
N	168	121	47
	$\chi^2 = 2.28$	$P = 0.131$	
(7) Loans			
No	65.61	62.50	73.67
Yes	34.39	37.50	7.33
N	168	121	47
	$\chi^2 = 1.86$	$P = 0.172$	
(8) Bonus or cash gifts			
No	83.64	79.87	93.40
Yes	16.36	20.13	6.60
N	168	121	47
	$\chi^2 = 4.5$	$P = 0.03$	
(9) Total number of fringe benefits received			
$\bar{X}$	3.39	3.57	2.92
N	170	124	46
	$F = 3.84$	$P = 0.052$	

Table 5: Regression Analyses of Weekly Wages and Number of Fringe Benefits for Full-time Employed Migrant Farmworkers in Wayne County, N.Y. 1982 (standard error in parenthesis)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables			
	Weekly Wages		Fringe Benefits	
	b	t	b	t
I. Human Capital Variables				
(1) Education	13.63 (4.94)	2.76**	-0.03 (0.52 ⁻¹)	-0.54
(2) Farmwork experience	2.13 (1.69)	1.26	0.27 ⁻² (9.17 ⁻¹)	0.16
(3) Years worked for the same employer	-.64 (4.19)	-0.15	0.13 (0.04)	3.11***
(4) Mental health status	0.58 (0.89)	0.65	0.03 (0.91 ⁻²)	3.66***
II. Other Variables				
(1) Sex	57.02 (30.81)	1.85*	0.44 (0.32)	1.37
(2) Age	-0.45 (1.47)	-0.31	-0.03 (0.02)	-1.50
(3) Migrant status				
Immigrant	86.46 (36.94)	2.34**	0.27 (0.39)	0.68
Recent migrant	4.96 (35.88)	0.14	1.18 (0.37)	3.20***
Long-term migrant	--	--	--	--
(4) Weekly wages	--	--	0.19 ⁻² (0.98 ⁻³)	1.92**
Constant term	-35.79 (92.59)	-0.39	0.153 (0.95)	0.55
Mean	\$219.70		3.81	
N	118		118	
R ²	0.081		0.219	
F	2.303**		4.680**	

* Significant at 7% level

** Significant at 5% level

*** Significant at 1% level